

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 22-28 and 36-37 are pending in this application. Claims 1-21 and 29-35 have been previously canceled. Claim 22 has been amended to replace “pharmaceutical composition” with “botulinum toxin” in step (d). Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0076].

### 35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 22-28 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant has amended claim 22 to replace “pharmaceutical composition” with “botulinum toxin” in step (d) in order to provide clarification of the subject matter being claimed. As such, the Applicant requests the Office withdrawal the rejection.

### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 22, 28 and 36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Graham (US Patent No. 6,939,852 B2) in view of Mohr et al. (US Patent No. 5,591,767). The Applicant respectfully traverses since Graham is not a proper obviousness reference.

35 U.S.C. 103(c)(1) states “[s]ubject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.”

Graham was filed March 22, 2002, as a continuation-in-part of U.S. Application No. 08/211,352 filed on September 16, 1992, now U.S. Patent 6,395,277 (the ‘277 patent). The ‘277 patent does not disclose transdermal administration of botulinum

toxin in accordance with the present claims. The disclosure the Office presumably uses to reject the present claims was first included in the March 22, 2002 filed Graham and is not entitled to the '277 patent's priority date of September 16, 1992. Instead, the disclosure the Office presumably uses to reject the present claims is entitled to a priority date of March 22, 2002. As such, the alleged disclosure of transdermal administration of botulinum toxin in accordance with the present claims can only be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e); and, if Graham was owned or subject to an obligation of common assignment at the time the claimed invention was made, it cannot serve as an obviousness reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(c).

Further, “[t]he applicant(s) or the representative(s) of record have the best knowledge of the ownership of their application(s) and reference(s), and their statement of such is sufficient evidence because of their paramount obligation of candor and good faith to the USPTO.” MPEP 706.02(l)(2).

#### Common Ownership

*The subject matter of the presently-pending claims and Graham were, at the time of invention, both owned by Allergan, Inc. or subject to assignment thereto.*

Since Graham only can be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and the present application and Graham were commonly owned (or subject to common assignment) at the time of invention of the present claims, Graham cannot be used to reject the present claims for obviousness. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Graham and Mohr et al. as applied to claims 22, 28 and 36 in further view of Smith (US Patent No. 5,587,396).

As discussed above, since Graham only can be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and the subject matter of the present claims and Graham were commonly

owned or subject to common assignment at the time of invention of the present claims, Graham cannot be used to reject the present claims for obviousness under 103(c). Accordingly, this rejection also should be withdrawn.

Claims 25 and 37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Graham, Mohr et al., Smith et al. as applied to claims 22-24, 28 and 36 and in further view of Mitragotri et al. (Science, Vol. 269, August 11, 1995).

As discussed above, since Graham only can be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and the subject matter of the present claims and Graham were commonly owned or subject to common assignment at the time of invention of the present claims, Graham cannot be used to reject the present claims for obviousness under 103(c). Accordingly, this rejection also should be withdrawn.

Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Graham, Mohr et al., Smith et al., Mitragotri et al., as applied to claims 22-25, 28 and 36-37 and in further view of Yuzhakov et al. (US Patent No. 6,656,532).

As discussed above, since Graham only can be available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and the subject matter of the present claims and Graham were commonly owned or subject to common assignment at the time of invention of the present claims, Graham cannot be used to reject the present claims for obviousness under 103(c). Accordingly, this rejection also should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 50-3207.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 14 May 2008

/Joseph Taffy/  
Joseph Taffy  
Registration No. 50973  
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 45,200

**KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS LLP**  
1900 Main Street, Suite 600  
Irvine, California 92614-7319  
Telephone: (949) 253-0900  
Facsimile: (949) 253-0902